UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/544,878	04/07/2000	Michael Dennis Krysiak	P/23-5-CIP	1363

7590 07/01/2002

Philip M Weiss
Weiss & Weiss
500 Old Country Road
Suite 305
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER	
VALENTI, ANDREA M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3643	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/544,878	Applicant(s) KRYSIAK ET AL.	
	Examiner Andrea M. Valenti	Art Unit 3643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 April 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-3* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19 and 4-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,250,660 in view of The Center for Professional Advancement, Briquetting, Pelletizing, Extrusion and Fluid Bed/Spray granulation by W.H. Engelleitner.

Regarding Claims 19-21, Kitamura teaches that it is old an well-known to make seed capsules in a single apparatus by preconditioning the seed with a binding agent while tumbling the seed; conditioning the seeds by tumbling the seed in a bed of fine particulate to create layers of matter about the seed (Kitamura Col. 1 lines 30-40 and Claim 1). Kitamura is silent on a tumble/agitation agglomeration operation. However, Engelleitner teaches that the tumble/agitation agglomeration operation is an old and well-known means of adding mass. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the teachings of Engelleitner to the teachings of Kitamura since the modification is merely the application of a known technology as an alternate equivalent means of encapsulation selected to meet certain manufacturing parameters.

Regarding Claims 4-18, Kitamura is silent on the various apparatuses listed in claims 4-18. However, these apparatuses are old and well-known seed coating or mixing machines. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify

the teachings of Kitamura with any of the machines listed in claims 4-18 since these are merely alternate equivalent agglomeration machines that perform the same intended function of agglomerating particles with a coating and one would select a particular agglomeration machine to satisfy different economic and time parameters and to accommodate different types of fertilizer of nutrient coatings.

Regarding Claim 22, Kitamura as modified is silent on the preconditioning and conditioning steps are repeated to add additional layers to the seed. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Kitamura since the modification is merely duplicating the process to provide a more comprehensive seed coat and does not present a patentably distinct limitation.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Kitamura inherently improves germination of the seed since the seed coat increases the survival rate of the seed in a mechanical sewing operation. Examiner suggests that applicant submit an affidavit under 37 CFR 1.132 illustrating that the tumble/agitation agglomeration process/machine is a different and unique process from the liquid agglormeration process. Furthermore, applicant does not claim nor describe in the specification the method step of pre-selecting the core seed.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea M. Valenti whose telephone number is 703-305-3010. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5pm M-F; Alternating Fridays Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M. Poon can be reached on 703-308-2574. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-306-4195 for regular communications and 703-305-0285 for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-4357.

AMV
June 26, 2002

Charles T. Jordan
CHARLES T. JORDAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600